

REMARKS**I. General**

Claims 1-8, 11-17, 19-27 and 30-32 are pending. Applicant hereby acknowledges the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3-5, 7-8, 13, 17, 19, 21-23, and 30-32. Claims 1-2, 6, 11-12, 14-16, 20, and 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0052914 (hereinafter *Zalewski*) and U.S. Patent No. 6,564,348 (hereinafter *Barenys*). Applicant hereby traverses the rejections of record, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of such in view of the remarks contained herein.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), *Zalewski* and *Barenys*

The Examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any prima facie conclusion of obviousness. M.P.E.P. § 2142; *In re Peehs*, 612 F.2d 1287, 204 USPQ 835, 837 (CCPA 1980). To support an obviousness rejection, “[u]nder § 103, the scope and content of the prior art are to be determined; differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are to be ascertained; and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved.” *Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City*, 383 U.S. 1, 15 - 17 (1966). Applicant hereby traverses the rejection.

A. Claims 1-2, 6, 11-12, and 14

Claim 1 recites “data that describes a configuration for the computer system.” In the Current Action, the Examiner admits *Zalewski* does not disclose these limitations, but instead introduces *Barenys* and appears to interpret the BIST signatures within *Barenys*’s vital product data (VPD) modules 290-296 as meeting these limitations. Applicant notes *Barenys* is silent as to its BIST signature describing a configuration of data processing system 200. Rather, *Barenys* teaches a BIST signature is a binary pattern generated by built-in self-test (BIST) circuitry of a chipset during power-on reset (POR). See *Barenys* col. 1, ll. 29-46. In other words, *Barenys* BIST signature is test data gathered when the system is powered on or reset that indicates

whether or not a chipset is properly operating. Hence, while *Barenys* BIST signature may be test data, it does not “describe a configuration for the computer system,” as set forth in the claim.

In addition, Applicant notes *Barenys*’s VPD modules merely store “information, such as product serial numbers, location of manufacturing, engineering change (EC) level data, FRU number, and part numbers that describe associated chips, boards, parts, etc.” *Barenys* col. 4, ll. 13-17. As such, while the information in *Barenys*’s VPD modules describe the individual parts themselves, the information in *Barenys*’s VPD modules fail to describe a configuration of data processing system 200. Hence, *Barenys* fails to teach “data that describes a configuration for the computer system.”

Claim 1 also recites “wherein each partition includes at least one cell board, and the service processor manages configuration of the partitions.” The combination fails to teach these limitations at least because *Barenys* does not teach that its service processor 244 “manages configuration of the partitions,” as set forth in the claim. In the Current Action, the Examiner admits *Zalewski* does not disclose these limitations, but instead introduces *Barenys* and appears to interpret *Barenys*’s service processor 244 as meeting these limitations. Current Action pp. 2-3. *Barenys* merely teaches “[s]ervice processor 244 detects errors and passes information to the operating system,” yet is silent to service processor 244 managing any form of partition of data processing system 200. Hence, *Barenys* fails to teach “the service processor manages configuration of the partitions.” Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 6, 11-12, and 14 each depend from and inherit all the limitations of claim 1. As discussed above, the cited art does not teach all the features and limitations of claim 1. Thus, the cited art does not teach all the features and limitations of claims 2, 6, 11-12, and 14. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

B. Claims 15-16, 20, and 24

Claim 15 recites “providing data, by the service processor, that describes an initial configuration for the computer system.” In the Current Action, the Examiner admits *Zalewski* does not disclose these limitations, but instead introduces *Barenys* and appears to interpret the BIST signatures within *Barenys*’s vital product data (VPD) modules 290-296 as meeting these limitations. Applicant notes *Barenys* is silent as to its BIST signature describing any configuration of data processing system 200. Rather, *Barenys* teaches a BIST signature is a binary pattern generated by built-in self-test (BIST) circuitry of a chipset during power-on reset (POR). See *Barenys* col. 1, ll. 29-46. In other words, *Barenys* BIST signature is test data gathered when the system is powered on or reset that indicates whether or not a chipset is properly operating. Hence, while *Barenys* BIST signature may be test data, it does not “describe a configuration for the computer system,” as set forth in the claim.

In addition, Applicant notes *Barenys*’s VPD modules merely store “information, such as product serial numbers, location of manufacturing, engineering change (EC) level data, FRU number, and part numbers that describe associated chips, boards, parts, etc.” *Barenys* col. 4, ll. 13-17. As such, while the information in *Barenys*’s VPD modules describe the individual parts themselves, the information in *Barenys*’s VPD modules fail to describe a configuration of data processing system 200, much less an initial configuration of data processing system 200. Hence, *Barenys* fails to teach data “that describes an initial configuration for the computer system.”

Claim 15 also recites “managing configuration of the partitions via the service processor.” The combination fails to teach these limitations at least because *Barenys* does not teach its service processor 244 “managing configuration of the partitions,” as set forth in the claim. In the Current Action, the Examiner admits *Zalewski* does not disclose these limitations, but instead introduces *Barenys* and appears to interpret *Barenys*’s service processor 244 as meeting these limitations. Current Action pp. 2-3. *Barenys* merely teaches “[s]ervice processor 244 detects errors and passes information to the operating system,” yet is silent to service processor 244 managing any form of partition of data processing system 200. Hence, *Barenys*

fails to teach “managing configuration of the partitions via the service processor.” Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 16, 20, and 24 each depend from and inherit all the limitations of claim 15. As discussed above, the cited art does not teach all the features and limitations of claim 15. Thus, the cited art does not teach all the features and limitations of claims 16, 20, and 24. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

C. *Claim 27*

Claim 27 recites “a service processor that is connected to each of the cell boards via at least one bus, wherein the service processor manages configuration of the partitions, and the service processor and each cell board stores a copy of data that describes a configuration for the computer system.” The combination fails to teach these limitations for at least two reasons. First *Barenys*’s BIST signatures (i.e., the data within the VPD’ modules) do not meet “data that describes a configuration for the computer system.” In the Current Action, the Examiner admits *Zalewski* does not disclose these limitations, but instead introduces *Barenys* and appears to interpret the BIST signatures within *Barenys*’s vital product data (VPD’) modules 290-296 as meeting these limitations. Applicant notes *Barenys* is silent as to its BIST signature describing a configuration of data processing system 200. Rather, *Barenys* teaches a BIST signature is a binary pattern generated by built-in self-test (BIST) circuitry of a chipset during power-on reset (POR). See *Barenys* col. 1, ll. 29-46. In other words, *Barenys* BIST signature is test data gathered when the system is powered on or reset that indicates whether or not a chipset is properly operating. Hence, while *Barenys* BIST signature may be test data, it does not “describe a configuration for the computer system,” as set forth in the claim.

In addition, Applicant notes *Barenys*’s VPD modules merely store “information, such as product serial numbers, location of manufacturing, engineering change (EC) level data, FRU number, and part numbers that describe associated chips, boards, parts, etc.” *Barenys* col. 4, ll. 13-17. As such, while the information in *Barenys*’s VPD modules describe the individual parts themselves, the information in *Barenys*’s VPD modules fail to describe a configuration of data

processing system 200. Hence, *Barenys* fails to teach “data that describes a configuration for the computer system.”

Second, *Barenys* does not teach that its service processor 244 “manages configuration of the partitions,” as set forth in the claim. In the Current Action, the Examiner admits *Zalewski* does not disclose these limitations, but instead introduces *Barenys* and appears to interpret *Barenys*’s service processor 244 as meeting these limitations. Current Action pp. 2-3. *Barenys* merely teaches “[s]ervice processor 244 detects errors and passes information to the operating system,” yet is silent to service processor 244 managing any form of partition of data processing system 200. Hence, *Barenys* fails to teach “the service processor manages configuration of the partitions.” Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 08-2025, under Order No. 10001728-3 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4).

Dated: September 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Thomas H. Kelton

Thomas Kelton

Reg. No.: 54,214

Date: September 20, 2007

Telephone No. (214) 855-7115